UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,106	09/27/2004	Gordon Smith Baxter	000131-00019	1291

27557 7590 02/23/2007

BLANK ROME LLP
600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
MORRISON, JAY A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2168	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,106	BAXTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 23-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 23-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 September 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-21 and 23-28 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-21,23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cappi (Publication Number 2002/0038308) in view of Chappell ('Understanding .NET: A Tutorial and Analysis", ISBN: 0201741628) and further in view of Hazlehurst et al. ('Hazlehurst' hereinafter) (Patent Number 5,974,412).

As per claim 1, Cappi teaches

A method of searching a plurality of information databases for records related to an input search term, comprising: (see abstract and background)

selecting a group of related search terms containing the input search term, from a search database of terms arranged in predefined groups according to their relationship with one another, wherein each term is present within one or more of the information databases; (paragraph [0072])

and displaying at least some of the corresponding records to a user. (paragraph [0090])

Cappi does not explicitly indicate "searching for terms from the selected group within a data repository comprising selected data previously extracted from the records of each information database, to identify corresponding records within the information databases which contain the terms within the selected group."

However, Chappell discloses "and, searching for terms from the selected group within a data repository comprising selected data previously extracted from the records of each information database, to identify corresponding records within the information databases which contain the terms within the selected group" (page 248, SelectCommand bulletpoint; page 249, figure 6-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi and Chappell because using the steps of "and, searching for terms from the selected group within a data repository comprising selected data previously extracted from the

records of each information database, to identify corresponding records within the information databases which contain the terms within the selected group" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to select information of interest. This gives the user the advantage of not have to examine extraneous information.

Neither Cappi nor Chappell explicitly indicate "the selected data from the plurality of information databases being semantically normalized in the data repository and being manipulated in the data repository to speed querying in the data repository relative to the plurality of information databases."

However, Hazelhurst discloses "the selected data from the plurality of information databases being semantically normalized in the data repository and being manipulated in the data repository to speed querying in the data repository relative to the plurality of information databases" (semantic structure retains, column 2, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi, Chappell, and Hazelhurst because using the steps of "the selected data from the plurality of information databases being semantically normalized in the data repository and being manipulated in the data repository to speed querying in the data repository relative to the plurality of information databases" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user have the data more efficiently stored. This gives the user the advantage of having faster access to the information.

As per claim 2,

Cappi does not explicitly indicate "the data repository is arranged as a number of records, each record corresponding to a record present within one of the information databases."

However, Chappell discloses "each record in the repository comprises a pointer identifying the record in the information database to which it relates" (page 249, first paragraph; figure 6-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi and Chappell because using the steps of "each record in the repository comprises a pointer identifying the record in the information database to which it relates" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to select information of interest. This gives the user the advantage of not have to examine extraneous information.

As per claim 3,

Cappi does not explicitly indicate "each record in the repository comprises a pointer identifying the record in the information database to which it relates."

However, Chappell discloses "each record in the repository comprises a pointer identifying the record in the information database to which it relates" (page 248, UpdateCommand bullet point).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi and Chappell because using the steps of "each record in the repository comprises a pointer identifying the record in the information database to which it relates" would have

given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to select information of interest. This gives the user the advantage of not have to examine extraneous information.

As per claim 4,

Cappi does not explicitly indicate "the amount of selected data in the repository is less than that contained in the information databases."

However, Chappell discloses "the amount of selected data in the repository is less than that contained in the information databases" (page 248, SelectCommand bullet point).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi and Chappell because using the steps of "the amount of selected data in the repository is less than that contained in the information databases" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to select information of interest. This gives the user the advantage of not have to examine extraneous information.

As per claim 5, Cappi teaches

"the data in the repository comprises definitional data" (paragraph [0010]).

As per claim 6, Cappi teaches

"the definitional data describe data in terms of its nature, use or value" (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 7, Cappi teaches

"the data in the repository comprises semantic data" (paragraph [0010]).

As per claim 8, Cappi teaches

"the semantic data describes alternative terms for the data in the information database" (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 9, Cappi teaches

Cappi does not expressly show "the semantic data describe synonymous terms in the information databases" (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 10, Cappi teaches

each term in each predefined group within the search database has associated meta-data indicating the one or more information databases within which the term is contained. (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 11, Cappi teaches

the associated meta-data indicates the corresponding records of the one or more information database(s) within which the associated meta-data is contained. (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 12, Cappi teaches

a number of records within the data repository are assigned to a domain. (paragraph [0078])

As per claim 13, Cappi teaches

the terms in the predefined groups within the search database are synonymous terms. (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 14, Cappi teaches

each group has an associated group identifier. (paragraph [0069])

As per claim 15, Cappi teaches

each group has associated descriptive data for describing the selected group. (paragraph [0067])

As per claim 16, Cappi teaches

determining a context of any repository records identified. (paragraph [0078])

As per claim 17, Cappi teaches

the context is determined by limiting the search to repository records having a common domain. (paragraph [0078])

As per claim 18, Cappi teaches

the context is determined by searching for the presence of one or more of the terms within the selected group, in the same corresponding record of the repository. (paragraph [0078])

As per claim 19, Cappi teaches

the context is determined by searching in related classes of terms. (paragraph [0069])

As per claim 20, Cappi teaches

the context is determined by the proximity of one or more related terms within a record. (paragraph [0010])

As per claim 21, Cappi teaches

A computer program product comprising: a computer readable medium; and computer program code means on the computer readable medium adapted to perform the method according to claim 1. (see abstract and background)

As per claim 23, Cappi teaches

A database searching system for searching a plurality of information databases for records related to an inputted search term, the system comprising: (see abstract and background)

a search database comprising related search terms arranged into predefined groups according to their relationship to one another, wherein each term is present within one or more of the information databases; (paragraph [0069])

selection means, for selecting a group containing the inputted search term from the search database; (paragraph [0072])

and displaying at least some of the corresponding records to a user. (paragraph [0090])

Cappi does not explicitly indicate "a data repository comprising selected data previously extracted from the records of each information database; searching means for searching the repository for terms from the selected group to identify the corresponding records within the information databases which contain the terms within the selected group."

However, Chappell discloses "a data repository comprising selected data previously extracted from the records of each information database; and, searching means for searching the repository for terms from the selected group to identify the corresponding records within the information databases which contain the terms within the selected group" (page 248, SelectCommand bulletpoint; page 249, figure 6-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi and Chappell because using the steps of "a data repository comprising selected data previously extracted from the records of each information database; and, searching means for searching the repository for terms from the selected group to identify the corresponding records within the information databases which contain the terms within the selected group" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to select information of interest. This gives the user the advantage of not have to examine extraneous information.

Neither Cappi nor Chappell explicitly indicate "the selected data from the plurality of information databases being semantically normalized in the data repository and being manipulated in the data repository to speed querying in the data repository relative to the plurality of information databases."

However, Hazelhurst discloses "the selected data from the plurality of information databases being semantically normalized in the data repository and being manipulated in the data repository to speed querying in the data repository relative to the plurality of information databases" (semantic structure retains, column 2, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Cappi, Chappell, and Hazelhurst because using the steps of "the selected data from the plurality of information databases being semantically normalized in the data repository and being manipulated in the data repository to speed querying in the data repository relative to the plurality of information databases" would have given those skilled in the

art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user have the data more efficiently stored. This gives the user the advantage of having faster access to the information.

As per claim 24, Cappi teaches

further comprising an input means for supplying the inputted search term to the selection means. (paragraph [0035]; figure 1, item 102)

As per claim 25, Cappi teaches

the input means comprises a communication network such that the inputted search term is received from a remote location. (paragraph 0035]; figure 1, item 102)

As per claim 26, Cappi teaches

a plurality of information databases from which data is extracted for storage within the data repository. (paragraph [0038])

As per claim 27, Cappi teaches

the data repository, is stored upon a separate computer system with respect to the information databases. (paragraph [0036])

As per claim 28, Cappi teaches

each group has associated descriptive data for describing the group. (paragraph [0010])

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 and 23-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100